

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

REMARKS

Introduction

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 1-19 and 76 are allowable in their present form.

Claims 1-20, 22, 23, 26-31, 34, 35, 52, 54 and 76 are pending in the application. Although claims 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 34, 35 and 52 were amended in Applicant's Amendment of April 13, 2009, in order to respond to the Examiner's objection in the Office Action mailed May 8, 2009, the listing of claims submitted in the present Response indicates the typographical markings required by 37 CFR 1.173. Claims 20, 34, 35 are currently amended. Claim 76 is amended in this present Response to address a minor typographical issue only and accordingly this amendment does not create any *Festo* issues. No new matter is being presented. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims are requested.

Objection to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to the amended claims due to informalities, specifically that certain amended claims did not follow the requirement of 37 CFR 1.173(b) in Applicant's Amendment of April 13, 2009. In order to respond to the Examiner's objection, the listing of claims submitted in the present Response indicates the typographical markings required by 37 CFR 1.173(b) of claims 20, 22, 23, 26, 28, 34, 35 and 52, which were amended in Applicant's Amendment of April 13, 2009. Further, in order to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.173(c), Applicant respectfully points out that support for the amended claims can be found in Applicant's specification, as follows.

With regard to amended independent claim 20, support for this claim can be found, for example, in col. 5, lines 62-67, col. 6, lines 1-24, and col. 7, lines 25-56 of Applicant's specification. Regarding dependent claims 22, 23, 26, and 28, support for these claims can be found, for example, in col. 6, lines 1-24 of Applicant's specification.

With regard to amended independent claim 34, support for this claim can be found, for

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

example, in col. 5, line 53-col. 6, line 24 and col. 7, lines 25-56 of Applicant's specification.

With regard to amended independent claim 35, support for this claim can be found, for example, in col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 36 of Applicant's specification.

With regard to amended independent claim 52, support for this claim can be found, for example, in col. 3, line 47-col. 4, line 36 of Applicant's specification.

Rejection under 35 USC §103 – Kishimoto and Watanabe

Claims 20, 22-23 and 34-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,134,390 to Kishimoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,268,887 to Wanatabe et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action mailed May 8, 2009 (hereinafter, "Office Action") the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses:

generating a pivot control signal to be supplied to a pivot circuit so as to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body (Fig 1, item 9; col. 5, lines 20-27; Fig. 1, item 2; col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4); and displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation (Fig. 1, item 4; Fig. 6; col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 1; col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4.)

The Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto "does not explicitly disclose that the image signal could be from external and 'converting scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen.'" The Examiner then alleges that Watanabe discloses "video signals could be generated from external (Fig. 1, item 1) and a method of displaying image signals having differing frequency corresponding to differing display scanning frequency of a display apparatus (col. 14, line 64-col. 15, line 2)."

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

The Examiner concludes that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Watanabe into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Watanabe discloses different frequency could be applied to in accordance to different display characteristics for the purpose of properly display an image [sic].” However, Applicant respectfully submits that Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant’s independent claim 20, for at least the following reasons.

To begin with, Kishimoto does not describe “manipulating a key located on the rotatable screen body,” as recited in independent claim 20. Fig. 1 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, merely illustrates a keyboard 2, on which a user can enter a command to activate a motor 115c to rotate the display 11 with the motor. Similarly, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that a user can cause the display 11 to rotate with the motor 115c using the keyboard 2. Kishimoto does not describe at any point where a user manipulates “a key located on the rotatable screen,” as recited in independent claim 20. Accordingly, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest, among other things, “manipulating a key located on the rotatable screen body,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 20.

Further regarding Kishimoto, the image input unit 4 in Fig. 1 of Kishimoto, alleged by the Examiner to “show” Applicant’s “converted color component video signals,” is actually an image scanner which merely scans image information (see col. 3, lines 30-32), and Kishimoto does not describe at any point where the image scanner 4 converts “color component video signals.” In fact, the Examiner acknowledges that Kishimoto does not teach or suggest “converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen,” as recited in independent claim 20. In addition, col. 5, line 66-col. 6, line 1 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that the guidance information 62 is displayed at different display positions on display screens 62 and 67. However, as Kishimoto states, the different display positions are only displayed in response to the display rotary position information 903 (see col. 6, lines 28-35), which is supplied according to the position detections signals 117a and 118a after the display 11 has been rotated by the motor 115c by a command from the keyboard 2. (As pointed out above, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

that a user can cause the display 11 to rotate with the motor 115c using the keyboard 2.)
Therefore, the guidance information 62 is only displayed based on the display rotary position information 903, and not based on the pressing of a key on the keyboard 2. Accordingly, Kishimoto also fails to teach or suggest, among other things,

displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body, and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation,

as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20.

In addition, Watanabe fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto for at least the following reasons. The Examiner's allegation that claim 2 of Watanabe describes "a method of displaying image signals having differing frequency corresponding to differing display scanning frequency of a display apparatus (col. 14, lines 64-col.15, line 2) where displaying scanning frequency is considered a display characteristic and the ratio of the two frequencies constitute a frequency ratio" is unsupportable. Claim 2 of Watanabe merely describes changing the frequency of a "first apparatus image signal of a scanning frequency" to substantially correspond to a "differing display scanning frequency" (col. 14, line 62-col. 5, line 2). Watanabe is directed to a display device which can convert an NTSC signal at 15.75 kHz to a double-speed signal of 31.5 kHz for display on a computer monitor. (See Watanabe, col. 1, lines 8-39.) As Watanabe states, display signals for personal computers generally use a frequency of 31.5 kHz, and so for 15.75 kHz NTSC signals to be displayed appropriately on a computer monitor, a double-speed converter is used to change the frequency of a demodulated NTSC signal to 31.5 kHz (see col. 1, lines 39-43). However, the double-speed conversion in Watanabe only involves converting an NTSC signal from one frequency (15.75 kHz) to another frequency (31.5 kHz) generally used for computer monitors. Watanabe does not describe at any point where the double-speed NTSC signal has a "certain frequency ratio" which corresponds to the computer monitor, but only states that the NTSC signal must be converted to a second frequency to be displayed on the computer monitor. In addition, Watanabe does not indicate at any point where the relationship between the NTSC frequency of 15.75 kHz and the double-speed frequency of 31.5 kHz is a "certain frequency ratio in correspondence with the display characteristics" of the computer monitor. Therefore, at no point does Watanabe describe where the double-speed NTSC signal has a "frequency ratio in

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

correspondence with the display characteristics of” the computer monitor. Accordingly, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest, among other things, “converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen panel,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 20, and which the Examiner admits is also lacking in Kishimoto.

Moreover, the Examiner’s allegations that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kishimoto and Watanabe to arrive at Applicant’s independent claim 20 are also without basis. At best, modifying Watanabe to Kishimoto as suggested by the Examiner would allow the monitor of Kishimoto to convert NTSC signals from 15.75 kHz to 31.5 kHz. However, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would still fail to teach or suggest “converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen,” as recited in independent claim 20. Furthermore, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would also still fail to teach or suggest “manipulating a key located on the rotatable screen body,” as recited in independent claim 20. Moreover, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would also still fail to teach or suggest “displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation,” as recited in independent claim 20.

Since Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 20, this claim is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Watanabe and is therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claims 22 and 23

It is respectfully submitted that claims 22 and 23 depend from independent claim 20, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Watanabe for at least the reasons pointed out above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 20, dependent claims 22 and 23 are also allowable

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

over Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another. Accordingly, claims 22 and 23 are allowable over Kishimoto and Watanabe, individually or in combination, and withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Claims 34 and 35

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 34, on pages 5-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 34, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto "does not explicitly disclose that the image signal could be from external and 'converting scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen.'" The Examiner then alleges that Watanabe discloses "video signals could be generated from external (Fig. 1, item 1) and a method of displaying image signals having differing frequency corresponding to differing display scanning frequency of a display apparatus (col. 14, line 64-col. 15, line 2)."

Regarding Applicant's independent claim 35, on pages 7-8 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 35, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto "does not explicitly disclose that the image signal could be from external and 'convert scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen.'" The Examiner then alleges that Watanabe discloses "video signals could be generated from external (Fig. 1, item 1) and a method of displaying image signals having differing frequency corresponding to differing display scanning frequency of a display apparatus (col. 14, line 64-col. 15, line 2)."

Regarding independent claims 34 and 35, the Examiner concludes that "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Watanabe into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Watanabe discloses different frequency could be applied to in accordance to different display characteristics for the purpose of properly display an image [sic]." However, Applicant

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

respectfully submits that Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's independent claims 34 and 35, for at least the following reasons.

To begin with, the Examiner's allegation that Kishimoto discloses generating "a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claims 34 and 35, is unsupportable. Col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that a user can cause the display 11 to rotate with the motor 115c using the keyboard 2. Fig. 1 of Kishimoto merely illustrates a keyboard 2, on which a user can enter a command to activate a motor 115c to rotate the display 11 with the motor. Hence, the keyboard 2 is only used by a user to enter a command to cause the motor 115c to physically rotate the display 11. This is distinctly different than generating a signal to display an OSD image "suitable to the rotated state of the rotatable screen body." Accordingly, Kishimoto fails to teach or suggest, among other things, generating "a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body," as recited in Applicant's independent claims 34 and 35.

Furthermore, the Examiner's contention that col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto describes "modifying OSD data corresponding to the OSD image including the OSD with respect to the pivot control signal," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 34, is also without basis. As pointed out above, col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that a user can cause the display 11 to rotate with the motor 115c using the keyboard 2, and furthermore, Fig. 1 of Kishimoto merely illustrates a keyboard 2, on which a user can enter a command to activate a motor 115c to rotate the display 11 with the motor. Hence, the keyboard 2 is only used by a user to enter a command to cause the motor 115c to physically rotate the display 11. Accordingly, Kishimoto also fails to teach or suggest, among other things, "modifying OSD data corresponding to the OSD image including the OSD with respect to the pivot control signal," as recited in Applicant's independent claim 34.

Moreover, since the Examiner acknowledges that Kishimoto fails to teach or suggest "converting scales of the input video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," Kishimoto also fails to teach or suggest, among other things, "displaying the converted picture," and "displaying the OSD image that corresponds to

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

the modified OSD data on the converted picture displayed on the rotatable screen,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 34. In addition, for similar reasons as pointed out above, Kishimoto also fails to teach or suggest, among other things, “a circuit unit to display the picture of the externally inputted video signals on the screen body and to display the OSD image at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal on the displayed picture,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 35.

In addition, Watanabe fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto for at least the following reasons. The Examiner’s allegation that claim 2 of Watanabe describes “a method of displaying image signals having differing frequency corresponding to differing display scanning frequency of a display apparatus (col. 14, lines 64-col.15, line 2) where displaying scanning frequency is considered a display characteristic and the ratio of the two frequencies constitute a frequency ratio” is unsupportable. Claim 2 of Watanabe merely describes changing the frequency of a “first apparatus image signal of a scanning frequency” to substantially correspond to a “differing display scanning frequency” (col. 14, line 62-col. 5, line 2). Watanabe is directed to a display device which can convert an NTSC signal at 15.75 kHz to a double-speed signal of 31.5 kHz for display on a computer monitor. (See Watanabe, col. 1, lines 8-39.) As Watanabe states, display signals for personal computers generally use a frequency of 31.5 kHz, and so for 15.75 kHz NTSC signals to be displayed appropriately on a computer monitor, a double-speed converter is used to change the frequency of a demodulated NTSC signal to 31.5 kHz (see col. 1, lines 39-43). However, the double-speed conversion in Watanabe only involves converting an NTSC signal from one frequency (15.75 kHz) to another frequency (31.5 kHz) generally used for computer monitors. Watanabe does not describe at any point where the double-speed NTSC signal has a “certain frequency ratio” which corresponds to the computer monitor, but only states that the NTSC signal must be converted to a second frequency to be displayed on the computer monitor. In addition, Watanabe does not indicate at any point where the relationship between the NTSC frequency of 15.75 kHz and the double-speed frequency of 31.5 kHz is a “certain frequency ratio in correspondence with the display characteristics” of the computer monitor. Therefore, at no point does Watanabe describe where the double-speed NTSC signal has a “frequency ratio in correspondence with the display characteristics of” the computer monitor. Accordingly, Watanabe fails to teach or suggest, among other things, converting “scales of the input color

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen panel,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claims 34 and 35, and which the Examiner admits is also lacking in Kishimoto.

Moreover, the Examiner’s allegations that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kishimoto and Watanabe to arrive at Applicant’s independent claims 34 and 35 are also without basis. At best, modifying Watanabe to Kishimoto as suggested by the Examiner would allow the monitor of Kishimoto to convert NTSC signals from 15.75 kHz to 31.5 kHz. However, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would still fail to teach or suggest converting “scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen,” as recited in independent claims 34 and 35. Furthermore, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would also still fail to teach or suggest, among other things, generating “a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable screen body,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claims 34 and 35. Moreover, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Watanabe would also still fail to teach or suggest, among other things, “displaying the converted picture,” and “displaying the OSD image that corresponds to the modified OSD data on the converted picture displayed on the rotatable screen,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 34. In addition, for similar reasons as pointed out above, Kishimoto also fails to teach or suggest, among other things, “a circuit unit to display the picture of the externally inputted video signals on the screen body and to display the OSD image at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal on the displayed picture,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 35.

Since Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant’s independent claims 34 and 35, these claims are patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Watanabe and are therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 52 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,632 to Register. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Claim 52

On pages 8-10 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Kishimoto discloses most of the features recited in independent claim 52, except that the Examiner admits, and Applicant agrees, that Kishimoto does not disclose “the image signal could be from external and ‘wherein the display unit comprises one or more function keys to change the operation settings thereof by indicating the rotated state of the display unit such that the circuit unit drives the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal in response to a selection of the one or more function keys’.”

The Examiner then cites Register alleging that it discloses “a method of rotating an OSD in which the image signal could be from external (Fig. 6, items 110, 112, 114, and 116) and the OSD is rotated by a key located on the screen body (col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4, where 54a and 54b are considered an OSD).” The Examiner concludes that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Register into Kishimoto because Kishimoto discloses a method of displaying an image and Register discloses manipulation of the OSD can be done by a key located on a displaying for the purpose of making a device more compact.” However, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Kishimoto nor Register whether taken alone or in combination with one another, teach or suggest every element of Applicant’s independent claim 52, for at least the following reasons.

To begin with, the Examiner’s allegation that Kishimoto discloses Applicant’s “a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD, respectively,” is unsupportable. Col. 4, line 64-col. 5, line 4 of Kishimoto, as relied on by the Examiner, only describes that a user can cause the display 11 to rotate with the motor 115c using the keyboard

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

2. Fig. 1 of Kishimoto merely illustrates a keyboard 2, on which a user can enter a command to activate a motor 115c to rotate the display 11 with the motor. That is, the keyboard 2 of Kishimoto is not used to request the display of the guidance information 66, but instead is used to enter a command to activate the motor 115c to physically rotate the display 11. Col. 5, lines 21-27, as relied on by the Examiner, only describe that the end position detection circuit supplies rotary position information about the display 11 detected by the position detection switches 117 and 118, and does not describe at any point where a key on the keyboard 2 is used to indicate a rotated state of the display 11 – Kishimoto only describes that a user can enter a command with the keyboard 2 to cause the display 11 to be rotated by the motor 115c. Further, Kishimoto does not describe at any point where the keyboard 2 is used to request the display of the guidance information 66. Accordingly, Kishimoto does not teach or suggest, among other things,

a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD, respectively,

as recited in Applicant's independent claim 52.

In addition, for at least the reason that Kishimoto does not describe Applicant's "control unit" as pointed out above, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things, "an OSD generator to generate an internal OSD image signal in response to an OSD driving signal." Kishimoto only describes using the keyboard 2 to cause the display 11 to be rotated by the motor 115c, and does not describe at any point generating an internal signal to display the guidance information 66 in response to a command from the keyboard 2.

Furthermore, the Examiner's allegation that Kishimoto discloses "a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit," is also without basis. Fig. 6 of Kishimoto illustrates that the image 65 is not rotated when the display 11 is rotated. As Kishimoto states regarding Fig. 6, "an image 65 of the image data is displayed on the screen at the same position, while the display 11 is physically rotated by 90 degrees." Therefore, even if Kishimoto could be interpreted to describe a "pivot control signal" (which Applicant disputes), Kishimoto clearly does

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

not describe where an image signal is displayed “at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal.” Accordingly, Kishimoto also does not teach or suggest, among other things,

a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit,

as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 52.

In addition, Register fails to remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto for at least the following reasons. Register merely describes that toggle buttons 28, 30, 32 and 34 may be used to rotate a screen image 52 in a display screen 26 of a personal digital assistant. (See Register, Col. 3, line 65-Col. 4, line 4.) However, col. 3, line 65-col. 4, line 4 of Register, as relied on by the Examiner, merely describes that the orientation of the screen image 52 may be toggled by a user. Register also only describes that command icons 54a and 54b are displayed at a side of the image 52 in the display screen 26 – however, Register does not describe at any point where the command icons 54a and 54b can be requested by a user. In fact, the command icons 54a and 54b are an inherent part of a program selected by a user. As Register states, when a user selects a program on the personal digital assistant, “[t]he operation of the selected program, using the control buttons 28, 30, 32, 34 and 40, is facilitated by the *continuous generation on the display screen 26* of four vertical rows of upper and lower command icons 54a, 54b.” (See Register, Col. 3, lines 22-46, emphasis added.) Furthermore, Register does not describe at any point where a “pivot control signal” is generated to display an on-screen display “suitable to a rotated state” of a “rotatable screen body,” since Register merely describes allowing a user to use toggle buttons to rotate a screen image 26, and does not describe how a “pivot control signal” is generated to display an OSD “suitable to a rotated state” of a “rotatable screen body.” Accordingly, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, “a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 52. Similarly, since Register does not describe generating a “pivot control signal” and an “OSD driving signal” according to a key manipulation by a user, Register also does not teach or suggest, among other things, “a circuit

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 52.

Moreover, the Examiner’s allegations that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Kishimoto and Register to arrive at Applicant’s independent claim 52 are also without basis. Since Kishimoto and Register each individually fail to teach or suggest, among other things, “a control unit to generate a pivot control signal to display the OSD image suitable to a rotated state of the rotatable display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request an OSD,” and “a circuit unit to drive the display unit to display the external image signal and to drive the display unit to display the internal OSD image signal at a rotated position in accordance with the pivot control signal generated by the control unit,” as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 52, the hypothetical combination of Kishimoto and Register suggested by the Examiner would still lack these elements of independent claim 52.

Since Kishimoto and Register, whether taken alone or in combination with one another, fail to teach or suggest each of the elements as recited in Applicant’s independent claim 52, this claim is patentably distinguishable over Kishimoto and Register and is therefore deemed allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejections and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Claim 54

It is respectfully submitted that claim 54 depends from independent claim 52, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Register for at least the reasons provided above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 52, dependent claim 54 is also allowable over Kishimoto and Register, whether taken alone or in combination with one another. Accordingly, claim 54 is allowable over Kishimoto and Register, either separately or combined, and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of this claim are earnestly solicited.

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 26-29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of Wanatabe and further in view of Register. It is respectfully submitted that claims 26-29 depend from independent claim 20, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Watanabe for at least the reasons pointed out above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 20, dependent claims 26-29 are also allowable over Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Further, Register does not remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto and Watanabe. For example, Register does not teach or suggest "converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," and "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation," as recited in independent claim 20.

Accordingly, claims 26-29 are allowable over Kishimoto, Watanabe and Register, individually or in combination, and withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Rejection under 35 USC §103

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of Wanatabe and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,329,289 to Sakamoto et al. It is respectfully submitted that claims 30 and 31 depend from independent claim 20, which is patentably distinguishable from Kishimoto and Watanabe for at least the reasons pointed out above. Therefore, for at least the reason that these claims contain each of the features as recited in independent claim 20, dependent claims 30 and 31 are also allowable over Kishimoto and Watanabe, whether taken alone or in combination with one another.

Further, Sakamoto does not remedy any of the deficiencies as pointed out above regarding Kishimoto and Watanabe. For example, Sakamoto does not teach or suggest

Serial No.: 10/775,058
Docket No.: 104-R001
Amendment dated August 7, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of May 8, 2009

"converting scales of externally input color component video signals to have a certain frequency ratio in correspondence with display characteristics of the screen," and "displaying a picture of the converted color component video signals on the screen body and displaying the OSD image on the displayed picture in accordance with the pivot control signal and the key manipulation," as recited in independent claim 20.

Accordingly, claims 30 and 31 are allowable over Kishimoto , Watanabe and Sakamoto, individually or in combination, and withdrawal of these rejections and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, there being no other objections or rejections, this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 502827.

Respectfully submitted,

STANZIONE & KIM, LLP

Dated: August 7, 2009
919 18th St., NW, Suite 440
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 775-1900
Facsimile: (202) 775-1901

By: 
David Hyams
Registration No. 50,947